

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claims 1-5, 12-13, 15-17 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,559,806 (Kurby et al.). Kurby is directed to a transceiver having steerable antenna and associated method therefore. Kurby utilizes a switch 640 to switch between a transmitter or receiver and the switch 640 does not switch between antennas 610 and 620. To the contrary, as noted in column 5 thereof, the antenna switch 640 connects the antenna element 610 and 620 to either a transmitter or a receiver and is not switched between each of the plurality of antennas based on a number of positioning satellites detected through each of the antennas as claimed. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims are also allowable as adding novel and non-obvious subject matter and are also allowable as at least depending upon allowable base claims.

Claims 1-5, 12, 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,089,824 (Uematsu et al.) or U.S. Patent No. 4,881,078 (Yamane et al.). Yamane is directed to a tracking system with a beam switching antenna that tracks “a stationary satellite” and utilizes an antenna beam that is switched between two directions periodically by control of phase constants in a feeding circuit of the antenna. The antenna is mechanically moved in azimuth according to the azimuth error signal until the azimuth error signal becomes zero. Yamane does not appear to be directed and does not appear to teach or suggest any method or operation that controls the switching between each of a plurality of antennas based on a number of positioning satellites detected through each of the antennas. In fact, Yamane appears to be directed to tracking a single stationary satellite and moreover does not control switching between each of a plurality of antennas based on a number of positioning satellites. In addition, the antenna described in Yamane is a single antenna with a pair of antenna elements and as such,

the antenna 11 is moved as a single unit to detect the satellite. There is no switching between each of the plurality of antennas based on a number of positioning satellites detected through each of the antennas as claimed. If the rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request a showing as to where the cited reference teaches the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

The Uematsu reference is directed to an antenna apparatus and attitude control method which detects the phase of the difference between signals received by at least two antennas. Antennas are divided into two groups which are individually driven. However, Applicants are unable to find any teaching or suggestion of, among other things, receiving signals from a plurality of positioning antennas and for example, controlling switching between each of the plurality of antennas based on a number of positioning satellites detected through each of the antennas as there does not appear to be any control based on such an operation. The cited portions of Uematsu appear to be silent as to any such operation. If the rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully request a showing as to where the cited references teach the claimed subject matter. In addition, it appears that the office action attempts to identify element 31 as the claimed beam selection structure. However, upon closer evaluation, it is actually an elevation motor which is used to control the facing direction of the antenna elements. Among other differences, there is no switching between each of the antennas based on a number of positioning satellites detected through each of the antennas, by a control circuit.

The dependent claims are also allowable as adding novel and non-obvious subject matter and are also allowable as at least depending upon allowable base claims.

Claims 6-11, 14, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurby et al. in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0090969 (Tse et al.).

Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above with respect to the Kurby reference as such, these claims are also in condition for allowance. For example, there is no teaching in Kurby of, among other things, a satellite network position signal processing circuit that determines a number of positioning satellites that are detected by a selected antenna and outputs information corresponding to a number of detected satellites nor a control circuit that switches between each of the plurality of antennas based on the number of positioning satellites detected. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance.

In addition, the Tse reference is directed to a double sided keypad and is not directed to a satellite detection device nor is there any teaching or suggestion to use the flip operation in Tse in the context of a satellite antenna system as claimed. Also, there does not appear to be any motivation mentioned in the office action to combine the teachings of the references. As such, the claims are in condition for allowance. In addition, there is not teaching or suggestion in the cited references of a beam selections structure operably coupled to the plurality of antennas and to the flip position detector. As such, the claims are in condition for allowance for at least one or more of the above reasons.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/1/05

By:   
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 North LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
PHONE: (312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005